IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYRNA AT CHANDIGARH

C.O.C.P. No.441 of 2006
Date of Decision:- 30.10.2006

Raj Singh ....Petitioner

through
Mr.Rajeev Dev Sharma, Advocate

vs.

Surinder Kumar Dawar & ors. ....Respondents

through
Mr.A.K.Chopra, Sr.Advocate with
Mr.Ashish Chopra, Advocate for
Nos.1 to 3.

Mr.H.S.Sethi, Advocate for No.4.

***

CORAM:-HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SURYA KANT

***

SURYA KANT, J.

The petitioner filed C.W.P.No.14014 of 2005 in which it was contended by him that his objections under Section 5-A of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 were not decided. While issuing notice of motion, this Court vide order dated 19.12.2005 stayed the petitioner's dispossession from the subject land till further orders.

Alleging that despite the above-stated interim order the petitioner was dispossessed and/or threatened to be dispossessed, this contempt petition has been filed.

In response to the show cause notice, learned counsel for the respondents has produced a certified copy of the order dated July 24, 2006 vide which the writ petition filed by the petitioner has been dismissed after observing that the objections under Section 5-A of the Act have already been disposed of after giving an opportunity of hearing.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, however, states that a review application has been filed in the above-mentioned case.

Be that as it may, in view of the fact that the main writ petition itself has been dismissed by this Court and the said order has yet not been recalled, I do not deem it appropriate to continue with these proceedings which are accordingly disposed of with liberty to the petitioner to get the same revived, if the need arises and/or so advised.

Rule discharged.

October 30, 2006 **(SURYA KANT)**
poonam **JUDGE**